

NEW YORK TIMES

8 APRIL 91 A 6

Excerpts From Letter to U.N.: Iraqis 'Accept This Resolution'

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 7 — Following are excerpts from a broadcast by the Baghdad radio today of the letter sent by Foreign Minister Ahmed Hussein of Iraq to the Secretary General of the United Nations and the President of the Security Council, accepting the Security Council's cease-fire terms, as monitored and translated by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, a United States Government agency:

Your excellency, I have the honor to inform you that the Iraqi Government has familiarized itself with the contents of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 of 1991. Those who adopted this resolution were the first to admit that is unprecedented in the history of the international organization. Before outlining its official stand, the Iraqi Government would like to make some substantial remarks on the concepts underlying the resolution and the provisions it contains.

1. Although its preamble affirms that Iraq is an independent and sovereign state, many of the resolution's unjust provisions do not respect this sovereignty.

The provisions of the Council's resolution regarding the border issue are unfair and set a serious precedent in the history of this international body, a precedent which derogates the sovereignty of states. This was confirmed by a number of impartial members of the Council in their interpositions during the vote on the resolution.

It must also be noted that the United States of America, which proposed the original draft for Resolution 687, which imposes solutions to the border dispute and other disputes between Iraq and Kuwait, refuses to impose any solutions on its ally Israel in accordance with the Charter and resolutions approved by the United Nations and international law. Furthermore, the United States of America has prevented the United Nations Security Council from shouldering its responsibilities toward the Arab-Zionist conflict and Israel's policy of annexing the occupied Arab territories, building settlements, expelling residents and denying the rights of the

Palestinian people and the neighboring Arab countries by vetoing any draft resolution approved by all other Council members, solely because Israel refuses to accept a resolution that seeks a just solution to the conflict.

Ban on Poison Gas

2. Iraq's position on the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons is clear. It is a party to the Geneva 1925 protocols regarding the prohibition of the use in war of incendiary and poisonous gas or similar means of bacteriological warfare.

Furthermore, Iraq is a party to the nuclear nonproliferation treaty of July 1, 1968, and honors its commitments under this treaty, as has been confirmed in numerous reports issued by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The U.N. Security Council resolution is binding on Iraq alone. It calls on Iraq to destroy some of the remaining nonconventional weapons still in its possession, but these weapons and other relevant installations were completely destroyed as a result of the military operations launched against Iraq by the coalition of 30 states. At the same time, the Security Council has allowed other states in the region, particularly Israel, to keep such weapons, including nuclear weapons.

3. Iraq's internal and external security has been and continues to be subjected to serious threats. There are constant attempts to interfere in Iraq's internal affairs by military means. Therefore, the measures adopted by the Council against Iraq, which infringe on its lawful right to acquire weapons and military equipment for defensive purposes, directly contribute to these threats and to the destabilization of Iraq at the expense of its internal and external security, and thus have a negative effect on the safety, security and peace of the entire region.

Demand for Reparations

4. While the Council's resolution outlines mechanisms for extracting reparations from Iraq, it makes no mention of Iraq's right to demand compensation for the enormous losses it

sustained and the mass destruction which was inflicted on the installations and infrastructure intended to improve the quality of life as a result of the way in which the authority of Resolution 678 of 1990 was conspicuously exceeded....

The Council has failed to explain to world public opinion and mankind's conscience the relationship between its Resolution 678 and the deliberate destruction of Iraq's infrastructure, including power and water plants, irrigation dams, bridges, telephone exchanges and factories.

ON ALLIED BOMBING

"The Council has failed to explain to world public opinion and mankind's conscience the relationship between its Resolution 678 and the deliberate destruction of Iraq's infrastructure, including power and water plants, irrigation dams, bridges, telephone exchanges and factories producing infant formula and medicine."

ries producing infant formula and medicine, in addition to shelters, mosques, churches, markets, residential neighborhoods and other facilities.

5. In Resolution 661 of 1990, the Council imposed binding comprehensive sanctions against Iraq on the grounds that it had not complied with Resolution 660. It has maintained most of these sanctions despite the fact that Iraq has accepted all the Council's resolutions and implemented many of their provisions....

In effect, this approach means that the Council has contradicted its original intent in imposing sanctions against Iraq, not to mention the fact that it failed to consider the losses the Iraqi people sustained and only took into consideration the interests of others, despite the fact that they are wealthy.

The resolution's clauses, which establish the use of biased criteria in international dealings and of double standards in issues of a similar nature, in practice hold Iraq and its people hostage to the will of a number of superpowers so that they can control its resources and requirements of food, clothing and the modern life which it seeks to achieve with dignity and pride.

Practicing such injustice and unfairness against a member state of the United Nations and its people cannot possibly be compatible with the principles and objectives of the U.N. Charter....

It is clear to all the world's honorable and fair people that these unfair and vindictive measures against Iraq are not a result of the events that took place on and after Aug. 2, 1990. Their real motive is the fact that Iraq has not accepted the unfair situation which was imposed on the Arab nation and the regional states many decades ago and which made Israel the dominant aggressive power in the region with the most modern and destructive conventional weapons and the weapons of mass destruction it possesses, including nuclear weapons.

Conspiracy Against Iraq

This fact confirms something Iraq had demonstrated before events of Aug. 2, 1990: namely, that Iraq was the target of a conspiracy that sought to destroy the resources it had provided to establish a just balance in the region that would have paved the way for the achievement of a fair solution and justice in it.

Regrettably, some states which originally had no desire to assist Israel and the United States to achieve their objectives have, perhaps unintentionally, contributed to this very end by voting in favor of this unfair resolution.

Your excellency: While making these principled, legal and legitimate remarks to urge conscientious members of the international community and world public opinion to understand the facts as they are and to uphold what is right, as it ought to be, Iraq finds itself before one alternative: to accept this resolution.

Please insure the distribution of this letter as a Security Council document....

STAT